

REMARKS

Formal Matters

Claims 1-44 constitute all currently pending claims in the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-16, 21-23, 25 and 27-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. 2002/0075844 A1 to Hagen (“Hagen”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,408,336 to Schneider (“Schneider”). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 requires “control means adapted to classify the terminals into a first group or a second group according to whether or not they are adapted to establish with said local area network communications encrypted in accordance with at least one format.” The Examiner contends that, although Hagen allegedly only teaches that grouping terminals into “of one said groupings being those MAC addresses who are located in the database, and those MAC addresses who are not located in the database,” the combination of Hagen in view of Schneider teaches the above quoted element of claim 1.

The portion of Schneider cited by the Examiner, however, only appears to discuss a “sensitivity level of a resource” or “trust level” of a resource. (Schneider at col. 10, lines 6-34.) This portion of Schneider teaches that the “trust level” is based on multiple factors, one of which, for example, is “the identification technique used to identify the user.” Assuming, arguendo, that the cited portion of Schneider does teach “that in order for a client to be able to access a network resource it must meet or exceed the trust . . . level of that resource,” as alleged by the Examiner at page 9 of the instant Office Action, this condition may clearly be met in the case that an identification technique having a high trust level is used, even without the use of encryption. In

contrast, claim 1 requires that classification of the terminals be “according to whether or not they are adapted to establish with said local area network communications encrypted in accordance with at least one format.” (emphasis added.) Since the “trust level” discussed in the cited portion of Schneider merely requires one or more of the trust indicators discussed therein, for example, an identification technique, to have a high trust level, Schneider fails to teach or suggest the specific requirements of the above quoted portion of claim 1.

Thus, Hagen and Schneider, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. The cited references, therefore, fail to render claim 1 unpatentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-27.

Independent claim 28, which recites features similar to those of independent claim 1, is therefore also patentable at least for reasons analogous to those presented above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner’s citation of Comer, “Internetworking with TCP/IP Vol. 1,” fails to make up for the above described deficiencies of Schneider, as Comer is cited merely for its alleged teaching of a cabled interface, i.e., Ethernet, and of a wireless LAN. Thus, the combined references, taken as a whole for what they would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, fail to render claim 28 unpatentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claim 28 and its dependent claims 29-44.

Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

This Application is being filed via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS).

Applicants herewith petition the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time if necessary. Any fee due under 37 U.S.C. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS). The USPTO is also directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 21, 2007